FMC
Copy 3
JUN 4 1950
Pam
Commun.

573

MISSIONARY RESEARCH LIBRARY NEW YORK CITY

FMC 473

Occasional Bulletin No. 2
(Second running)

Background Papers

for

MISSIONARY POLICY IN THE CHRISTIAN APPROACH TO COMMUNISM

Addresses given at the Annual Meeting of the
Foreign Missions Conference of North America
Buck Hill Falls, Pennsylvania
January 5, 1949

I. A Christian Critique of Communism — by Matthew Spinka, Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary

II. Communist Practices in Dominated Areas — by Eugene E. Barnett, General Secretary, International Committee of Y.M.C.A.

III. Communist Tactics in Penetrated Areas — by T. Cuyler Young, Professor in Princeton University

also

COMMUNISM'S CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIANITY

An address by Mr. Kermit Eby,
of the faculty of the University of Chicago and formerly
Research Director for the Congress of Industrial Organizations
delivered at the Foreign Missions Assembly
Columbus, Ohio, October 8, 1948

Circulated in mimeographed form by
Committee to Study a Christian Approach to Communism
of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America
156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y.

Additional Copies at 10¢ per copy postage prepaid may be obtained at this address

I.

A CHRISTIAN CRITIQUE OF COMMUNISM

by Matthew Spinka

Although the subject which I propose to deal with sounds abstractly academic, I do not intend to engage in a detached, pedantic disquisition of Christian and communist ideologies. Rather do I conceive my task to be the formulation of an existential statement of our living faith on behalf of which some of our brethren have already suffered persecution in some parts of the world, and for which many more are likely to risk security. For we must realize that upon the issues of the conflict may depend the very conditions under which the Christian Church must carry on its work in the future. If ever Christians were confronted with stark realities, and had to deal with them both factually and with holy imagination, without self-deluding complacency as to assured results, but likewise without panicky hysteria, this is the time. It is not for us to assume that victory in this strife shall be automatically ours no matter what we do or leave undone; nor are we warranted in assuming that our Western Christianity is so impotent and decadent that there is no hope of averting the final catastrophe. Let us approach this subject with sober realism, without complacent over-confidence; but likewise without defeatism which sometimes leads Christians to compare the utopian dreams of communism with the sorry actualities of secularized Western civilization which they confound with Christianity, to the detriment of a realistic judgment as to the relative merits of the case.

If the aim of Marxian-Leninist-Stalinist communism be stated at its best - as an attempt to realize social and economic justice by a reorganization of human society, so that exploitation of man by man, poverty, and war would cease - then Christianity could indeed claim the same aims for its own. But on the one hand, Christianity goes farther in its demands, and insists that only by a spiritual transformation of humankind can a radical social change be achieved; and on the other hand, Christianity rejects the means whereby communism seeks to attain its goals. It holds that evil means are not justified by good ends.

I. In the first place, then, even if, for argument's sake, we regard communism as a movement for a just organization of society - an assumption which has repeatedly been given the lie by the factual evidence based on what communists do rather than say - Christianity transcends communist aims by insisting that man shall not live by bread alone. The true significance of human life is spiritual, not exclusively or predominantly economic. The communist concept of good society, even in its maximal extent as given in terms of a classless society, is not radical enough; for it leaves out of consideration the spiritual element. But transformation of society is primarily a spiritual problem - not political or economic. Only the spiritual element can provide the dynamic needed for such a change.

Implementing this conception, Christianity regards human personality as the highest value. "For what doth a man profit if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" But the concept of personality is not identical with that of the biological or sociological concepts of individuality. Personality is not a native, natural endowment; it is a hard-won ethical achievement. It is the conquest of the body-mind entity by the transformed spirit - a spirit which has surrendered itself to God. Good society is composed of such transformed personalities. There can be no good world unless mankind be spiritually changed. Whatever technological economic, political, sociological, or cultural improvements mankind may achieve,

these are good and valuable only potentially: what makes them positively good is when they become means for the realization of the highest goal, the greatest spiritual maturity of mankind. They must be ethically controlled, for otherwise they may, and usually do, become instruments of perversion and destruction. Accordingly, the worthiness or unworthiness of a given society may best be judged in accordance with this test: does it aim and tend toward the development of human personality, or does it regard man as a means toward some other end? Judged by this criterion, a society which places economic well-being as the highest human value - and both capitalistic and communistic societies do - does not rank very high. The economic system must exist for man's highest benefit, not man for economy's benefit.

Communism then denies the spiritual nature of man; thence derives its anti-humanistic ethic. Vishinsky denied at Paris that man has any inalienable rights. But the denial of man as a spiritual being is indissolubly connected with the denial of God. For no one can believe in the spiritual potentialities of man - in the creation of man in God's image, to use a Christian theological phrase - who does not believe in the God who created man. Intelligent, logically consistent atheism must necessarily regard man as a psycho-physical organism, if not mechanism, animated by the incomprehensible thing called life, and driven by hunger plus a large variety of desires and passions. Old fashioned materialism could at least be logical. But such a philosophy would prove utterly unsuitable for a revolutionary; for he must be able to play a free, creative role in order to change the world, destroy the old and create a new society. But Marx chose both to eat his cake and have it: by defining his system of thought as "dialectical materialism", he wedded two incompatibles in a quarrelsome marriage. He insisted upon standing the Hegelian philosophy on its head by substituting matter for the Absolute Idea of Hegel. But strangely enough, his matter possesses a spiritual quality, and as such can never be harmonized with any realistic concept of materialism, which must necessarily be deterministic. Nevertheless, the spiritual qualities of matter are but an "opiphenomenon," a foam on the beer, a product of the fundamental reality, namely, the economy of a given period. Marx wrote: "Religion, science, morality, politics, legislation, education, and art receive their content and their form from the procreative power of the material conditions and the economic necessities of their time." But if they are a mere product of the economic substructure, they possess no independent reality. Justice is then determined by economic conditions, and can never determine them. In such a case, if justice and injustice are both by-products of a given economic order, no basic ethical distinction can be made between them; moreover, it is a folly to expect that justice, if it be merely a by-product of the economic conditions, can change the very conditions which gave it rise.

II. Christianity, therefore, rejects the materialistic, atheistic philosophy of communism, because the latter necessarily denies the spiritual nature of man; but it likewise rejects the means whereby communism proposes to attain its goal. Among the latter may be named, in the first place, the use of force, war, as not only inevitable, but as inherent in the very nature of the historical process. The forcible overthrow of the capitalistic class by the only class free from the original sin of exploitation - the proletarian - is a basic dogma of the communist system. The old society cannot be reformed, or transformed by a gradual process of a democratic character; it must be destroyed, overthrown, eliminated. Communism is not a reforming, but a revolutionary, movement. This is fundamental to a proper understanding of it. To suppose that communism can be appeased, diverted from its revolutionary task, by changes in the prevailing economic system - even by socialistic changes - is to be tragically mistaken in respect of the real character of communism. President Benes of Czechoslovakia made that mistake, for which his country has to pay dearly. Since communism denies spiritual unity on principle, the use of force must be substituted as the only means of unifying

society. To make force effective to a maximal degree, it must be ruthless and brutal. Christianity cannot approve the use of violent means, ruthless force, as the primary means for the realization of a just social order, but only as a restraint against disorder. It advocates a peaceful transformation of society, by retaining as far as possible the hard-won human rights and liberties, whatever political system may prevail in a given country. It sanctions the use of force only as that is necessary for the preservation of peace, justice, and order, and allows war only as the last resort, where the alternative would be the greater evil.

An objection may be raised that the recent expansion of communist power has been won without war. True; but not without a violent overthrow of the existing regimes, and without the use of force. The technique of "boring from within", and the "cold war" which is at present waged in preference to open warfare, do not contradict the thesis that war is inherent in communism. They are merely cheaper and provisionally more effective methods by which the communists opportunistically adjust themselves to changing circumstances; but they all aim to secure the same revolutionary ends. The methods of fifth column infiltration, unscrupulous diplomacy and propaganda, deliberate creation of industrial and political unrest, subversive activity in labor unions and other organizations, and countless other forms of underground activity on a world-wide scale, have been used with excellent results. In case of need, open warfare is always held in reserve.

Since communism is by its very nature a world-wide revolutionary movement, the communist state is organized as a dictatorship over all the resources of the country it dominates, both human and material. Such a government is of necessity totalitarian. Theoretically, this stage of development is temporary, and is to be succeeded by an ultimate democratic stage: for after the government, by means of "dictatorship of the proletariat," had secured victory over its enemies within and without, it will presumably "wither away", to give place to the final stage of classless society wherein, as Lenin thought, any cook can run the show. Actually, however, one does not notice any tendency, or desire, for that matter, on the part of the Soviet regime "to wither away." Nor does it appear too healthy within the Soviet Union to make inconvenient references to this doctrine, although outside the Union communist apologists capitalize on it: Andrei Vishinsky, in his work recently published in this country, records that two prominent Bolsheviks, high state functionaries - Krylenko and Pashukanis - were shot for featuring too prominently their faith in this apocalyptic dogma.

Being a totalitarian regime, communism claims the right of ethical autonomy. Properly speaking, consistent communism should be amoral. For if ethics be but a product of a given economic order, all ethics cease to be ethical. Nevertheless, there is such a thing as communist ethics. Of course, this code differs radically from the "bourgeois" ethics. It may be summarized in the phrase that whatever is conducive to the victory of communism as directed by the Party, is right and ethical; everything else is wrong. As Alexander Miller writes in his Christian Significance of Karl Marx; "It is pointless to indict Marxism because it tolerates or even encourages ruthlessness, lying, and the weapons of terror, or because we find among the communists the kind of laxity in personal behaviour which conventional morality condemns..." For the highest loyalty of a communist belongs to his Party - not to some divine or natural ethical order of the universe, or to his nation, his family, or even to his personal convictions. All means, whatever their character, are good if they promote the cause. Accordingly, the sudden reversals of a given course of action - many examples of which could be cited in the careers of Molotov, Vishinsky, or Brower - do not imply change of principles, but merely a change in tactics. The objectives always remain the same. Among these tactical means, most useful are appeals to conventional ethics (secularized Christian virtues) - such as a concern for justice, indignation against tyranny or exploitation,

denunciation of warmongering, lip service to the cause of "peoples' will" and "true democracy," and the like. It is astonishing how many people mistake such stock-in-trade of the revolutionary propaganda for genuine coin.

Christianity rejects all subservience to the modern half-gods in place of the true God. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" is a paramount obligation. The Church insists that individuals as well as nations are subject to God's ethical order which may be defied only at the peril of those who revolt against it or neglect it. God is the Lord of all, whether or not they acknowledge Him as such; His will shall ultimately prevail. The rage of man cannot overthrow it.

Furthermore, there is inherent in Christianity a demand for freedom. All spiritual life demands freedom, is impossible without freedom. No true ethical action is possible unless it is free. Although certain formal freedoms have again been granted to the Church in Soviet Russia, they still fall short even of the very restricted measure of freedom which the tsarist regime had granted it - a measure denounced by communists themselves as a travesty. The Russian Church is once more utilized by the state for its own purposes. Subservience to the state is the cost of whatever liberties the Russian Church possesses. The precarious situation in this regard is well illustrated by the fact that the discriminating, illiberal laws which had been passed during the period prior to the change in religious policy, have not been rescinded.

In summing up the critique of the communist ideology and methods, it is evident, I hope, that there exists a fundamental incompatibility between the Christian and communist principles and methods which cannot be bridged. There can be no such thing as Christian communism, if the latter term be understood in the Marxian sense. As the Amsterdam Assembly formulated the matter, "the Church should seek to resist the extension of any system that not only includes oppressive elements but fails to provide any means by which the victim of oppression may criticize or act to correct it. It is a part of the mission of the Church to raise its voice of protest wherever men are the victims of terror, wherever they are denied such fundamental human rights as the right to be secure against arbitrary arrest, and wherever governments use torture and cruel punishments to intimidate the consciences of men." But neither can there be an identification of Christianity with the laissez faire capitalism. Christianity must never be used as a defense of the injustices or tendencies to injustice inherent or operative in the present structure of society.

Above all, it must be remembered that even though we may be wholly and profoundly convinced of the immeasurable superiority of the Christian cause over that of communism, the Church may still suffer an irreparable damage in the conflict in which the two systems are engaged by failure of Christians adequately and realistically to implement their faith. The fault is not that of Christianity, but of Christians. The conflict is no longer merely an ideological one; it has taken the form of a life-and-death struggle in many parts of the world. For Christianity just as for communism, the primary concern is not merely to understand life theoretically, but to change it. To pray, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," lays upon the Christians the obligation to dedicate themselves to the realization of the kind of world they are praying for. The best critique of communism that Christianity can offer is to out think, out do and out love it.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2021 with funding from
Columbia University Libraries

https://archive.org/details/backgroundpapers00fore

II.

COMMUNIST PRACTICES IN DOMINATED AREAS

by Eugene E. Barnett

The backdrop of our discussion this evening is one of bewildering dimensions and complexity. World Christianity, World Communism, World Crisis in Civilization, World Revolution, to say nothing of the World Power Struggle and the world-wide conflict of ideologies now going on - such is the perspective against which we must try to view the questions before us in this evening's meeting. What should be the next steps in our Christian approach to Communism? How, specifically, should we deal with situations likely to arise in Communist-dominated areas?

I would like to suggest that our main concern is not with Communism as an economic system seeking to supplant Capitalism. While only a narrow and dogmatic view can accept Communism's economic determinism and its dialectic materialism as an adequate interpretation of history, we dare not brush aside its penetrating analyses of social inequalities and conflicts or the appeal which it is making to so many people in our time. Amsterdam was faithful to its Christian rule when after stating some of the reasons for the appeal which Communism holds for great masses of people, it called attention to the points of irreconcilable conflict which exist between Christianity and atheistic Marxist Communism, and then pointed out some of the sins and shortcomings to be found in Capitalism also.

I am sure, however, that the attraction which Communism holds for most of its followers does not lie mainly in its economic theories, but in the program and techniques of social change which it seems to offer. Sixteen months ago, in Rangoon, I had a long conversation with Thakin Nu, Prime Minister of Burma - a gentle and scholarly young man, a devout Buddhist and himself not a Communist; yet standing at the crossroads in the history of his country, with one eye turned on Communist Russia and the other on capitalistic America, he had come to see in Russia the champion of the underdog and of change, and in America the champion of privilege and the status quo. That conclusion, ill-informed and unfair though it is, undoubtedly exists in many quarters today.

One recalls the Communist-inspired anti-Christian agitations which swept China in the '20's when Christianity was attacked as the agent of Western Imperialism, the enemy of change, and an obstacle which must be removed before the progress possible in a scientific age could be achieved. Incidentally, that episode in recent Christian history is highly relevant to our discussion this evening. That "religion is an opiate of the people", that missionaries are agents of imperialistic powers, and that Chinese Christians are "the hawks and hounds of the imperialists" were the familiar slogans of that period. Slogans were matched by action and at one time, out of 8,000 missionaries then on the China roster, only 500 remained in all of China's interior; the rest had fled to their homelands or taken refuge in a few port cities or in nearby countries.

For the thousands of young Chinese who, in the '20's and since, have flocked to the Communist cause, or at least for most of them, I am persuaded that the great appeal of Communism lies in the fact that it seems to provide effective techniques of change in a situation where changes are desperately needed, - a revolutionary program capable of doing a thorough job of it. While thousands of Chinese Commun-

ists have during the past quarter century received their indoctrination in Leninist-Marxism as elaborated by Stalin and Mao Tse-tung, I venture the opinion that Communism is still winning most of its following in China because of the drastic program of social and political change which it appears to offer.

But the challenge of Communism comes to Christianity at a deeper level still. It was the Jerusalem meeting of the International Missionary Council in 1928 that singled out secularism as the foremost rival with which Christianity (along with all religions) is now faced throughout the world. In Communism we confront the articulate, organized and militant wing of that rival secular "religion". "The passion of anti-religious propaganda and persecution in Soviet Russia", said Nikolai Berdiaev a good many years ago, "is comprehensible (only) if Communism is regarded as a religion which aims at replacing Christianity."

The pseudo-religious character which world-wide Communism has achieved has long been noted: in the absoluteness of its claims upon its followers; in the dominion it asserts over the whole range of human thought and activity; in the dogmatic authority it ascribes to Marx, Lenin, and Stalin and their writings; in the sense of inevitable destiny with which it inspires its "believers", in the loyalty superseding all other loyalties which it excites in its followers; and in its missionary ardor to "evangelize the world in this generation." Such is the Communism with which Christianity finds itself confronted in our time - a Communism which is out to build a new world, and in doing so, to remake human nature itself insofar as that is necessary.

"Without revolutionary theory", declared Lenin, "there can be no revolutionary movement." Stalin, we are told, has steadfastly adhered to this dictum, as presumably Communist leaders generally have continued to do. It is not within my assignment or competence to set forth what that theory comprehends, but let me mention three things about it because of their special pertinence to our subject this evening. First, the Communist revolution is a world revolution. Second, Communists from other lands have gone by thousands to Russia for their indoctrination and training in the theory and the tactics of that world revolution. And third, Communist leaders in practice have combined great flexibility in tactics with great clearness and consistency in their long-range strategy and objectives.

Note by way of example how these three facts work out in a country like China. First, while the Communist program in that country addresses itself to indigenous problems, it is nevertheless carried forward as part of a world revolution, a revolution which must triumph everywhere if it is to succeed anywhere, and in which Soviet Russia is the acknowledged spearhead and accepted leader. Second, while Communist leaders in China are Chinese, Russians since 1927 being conspicuous by their absence from the immediate scene, the Chinese leaders themselves have been trained in Russia or by Russian-trained leaders of their own, and with "good Communists" elsewhere they look to Moscow for their major lines of strategy and tactics. And third, while at times and under certain conditions the regime may show tolerance toward alien elements under its control, it should not be hastily concluded that this represents change in fundamental doctrine or long-range objectives, instead of tactics dictated by expediency.

A writer last July in a long article in the London Times describes three types of Communist regimes which have appeared in Europe since VE Day. First, there have been, at least for brief periods of time, genuine coalitions in which Communists and non-Communists have shared the responsibilities of government. Second, there have been what the writer called bogus coalitions in which certain posts have been given to non-Communists, but all real power is held by the Communists. And

third, there have been countries in which the Communists have gone all the way and established their one-party governments. It would not be unfair, I think, to Communist doctrine or tactics to describe these three types of situations as three stages in the march of Communism toward its goal.

In most if not all countries, there are non-Communists including some Christians, who have concluded that they can make common cause with the Communists in overthrowing certain evils, and then can part company with them before the third stage of totalitarianism has been reached. Sun Yat Sen thought the same when in January 1924, he admitted members of the Communist Party into the Nationalist Party, but in the spring of 1927 that coalition came to an explosive end, since when "all the King's horses and all the King's men have not been able to put it together again." As we enter 1949, multitudes in China, weary unto death with the status quo, appear ready to give the Communists a trial, hoping that change even under them may be for the better and that immemorial character and custom will make Chinese Communists "different" from their more ruthless confederates in Russia and Eastern Europe.

While obviously this hope should not be dismissed out of hand, we nevertheless do well to keep in mind the special character and strength of the Communist Party at the center of the present revolution - "a disciplined order of devoted adherents", as Sir John Maynard has described it, "more nearly resembling (a religious order) than any of the lax aggregations of political sympathizers to which we are accustomed to apply the name of political party." It is this "small compact core consisting of reliable and hardened workers, with responsible agents in the principal districts, and connected by all the strict rules of secrecy" that has brought one country after another into the Communist orbit and sowed the seeds of revolution in many others.

I am deliberately refraining from any detailed description of Communist practices in dominated areas. The mass appeal which the Communists make to the dispossessed and the discontented, and to many others sensitive to the miseries and oppressions of their fellowmen; their readiness to liquidate unfriendly or unreliable elements; and their skill in the infliction of exemplary punishments designed to discourage counter-revolution, are well known. Well known also is their rejection of religion as a valid faith or philosophy in contemporary life and the pragmatism with which they vary their tactics in relationship to religious institutions as times and conditions dictate.

For some in this room, missionaries on furlough, and for many fellow-workers in other lands whom we have in mind this evening, this matter of Communist domination and how to deal with it has become a condition which must be met and not just a theory of intellectual interest. May I suggest, however, the importance of our taking thought with respect to both the theory and the condition by which we are confronted. First of all, that is, we must endeavor to understand Communism. As the late Dr. Berdiaev pointed out years ago, "It is necessary for us to understand the truth in Communism if we are to overcome its untruth." This observation of the outstanding Russian Christian thinker of our time was no word of appeasement toward a system which militantly denies God, sees "the material life of society.. (as) primary and its spiritual life as purely secondary and derivative" (Stalin), and believes that its earthly paradise can be established only through class hatred, bitterness and warfare. It does recognize the ethical challenge in Communism's demand for the righting of ancient wrongs and its acceptance of man's responsibility toward the shaping of his own history. It takes into account the heroes and the martyrs which Communism has inspired and the importance of understanding wherein this power lies.

I wonder if Mission Board members and staffs do not have an unusual vantage point from which to see world Communism in action, to observe its spirit, aims and methods, and to help Christians in America and among the younger churches to comprehend the nature and the meaning of this dynamic, not to say demonic, movement of our times.

In the second place, Communism and its forthright rejection of religion, challenges us to understand and practice Christianity better. One of the chief merits of John Bennett's little book on Christianity and Communism is the summary analysis and interpretation it presents not only of Communism, but of Christianity. We do well to remember the revolutionary force that Christianity has been in history. And yet can we not see that too many of us so-called Christians have in the words of Henry Hodgkin been "inoculated with a mild form of Christianity which has made us immune against the real thing." That brand of Christianity, accommodating itself too easily to things as they are, does not meet the demands of this period of revolutionary upheaval and change.

As Christians, we dare not be content with things as they are, for the status quo holds little attraction for a great many people in our time. It holds little attraction for people suffering the bondage of poverty, ignorance, and disease; for many millions of uprooted people; for people seeing no escape ahead from the deprivations which too long have been their lot; for people smarting under alien rule or exploitation and oppression from whatever quarter. The status quo has little attraction for young people for whom the road to a better future is always likely to look straighter and easier than actually it is. It is not enough for us to rail against the false promises with which Communism beguiles these people to deeper disappointment, disillusionment, and frustration. The time has come for Christianity to take leave of the defensive and to seize the initiative with a message of God the Father of Mankind and a program which men once more will recognize as good news.

Wherever Communism is in control we must expect difficulties in our proclamation of the Christian message, and in the programs of education, healing and ministry to human needs in which the Church has been engaged. It has been suggested that under Communism the Church is likely to pass through three phases or stages of experience: first, a period of relative freedom; second, a period of restrictions; and finally, a period in which much of the program of the Church and its agencies may be declared illegal and incompatible with the aims of the revolution. I am not suggesting that developments will surely take this course, but that we should be alert to the possibility and make ready for whatever comes.

The conspicuous failure of the Society of the Militant Godless to wipe out religion in Russia illustrates what can be expected where Christianity has a strong hold upon the life of the people. The anti-Christian agitations of two decades ago in China dispersed the missionaries, scattered many Chinese Christians, and destroyed much Church property, yet in retrospect the ordeal is seen to have purified and strengthened Christianity in that country. The Church now must be on its guard not only against violence but even more against the more subtle perils of compromise.

The Churches can afford greatly to curtail their activities, if official restrictions make this necessary. But when an institution or program can be continued only at the cost of violating its essential Christian character and purpose it is better for it to close down than to keep going at that price. Numerous policy statements from China reflect a common conviction on this point. The Church may not be banned completely, even in non-Christian countries where Church memberships are comparatively minute, though this has happened more than once in the past. Should it occur again we may well expect Christianity in the catacombs to show its visibility again.

What should missionaries do when their place of residence and work comes within the orbit of a Communist regime? Dr. Chen Chin-yi, speaking as general secretary of the National Christian Council to an audience of missionaries in Shanghai in April 1927, referred to the "unexpected"and "unparalleled" evacuation of missionaries from the interior then taking place as a result of severe persecution, usually at the request or with the concurrence of their Chinese colleagues, and under definite orders from their consular representative. He spoke regretfully though without a trace of reproach. Dr. S.C. Leung, speaking the other day as chairman of the National Christian Council to a group of missionaries in Shanghai, expressed the hope that at least a "task force" of missionaries will find it possible to remain this time in every part of the country. The Christian Church, he pointed out, is international and world-wide, and the presence of missionaries symbolizes and strengthens this ecumenical character of the Church. Some of you know of the statement made one month ago by a group of Chinese Christian leaders in which they state their "conviction that the Christian Church in China needs missionaries more now than ever before." That "conviction" leaves many specific questions unanswered and many difficult decisions yet to be made, but its implications provide a basic starting point, for such questions and decisions as they arise.

The American missionary in a Communist dominated area must reckon with a position of unusual delicacy. The individual missionary may himself be a "world Christian" in the best sense of that term, but he is also the citizen of a country more and more regarded as the chief obstacle, not to say enemy, of the Communist world revolution. In general, Protestant Churches wisely have refrained from identifying themselves with political parties in any country. Actually American personnel are now working in certain Communist dominated areas in both Europe and Asia without compromising their Christian integrity and without involvement in political developments. Time only will tell whether this possibility will go on indefinitely or will turn out to be a passing phase. Surely while preparing for the worst we should hope for the best and with God's help endeavor to make the best come true. Communism does not change in a hurry, but our faith in God and in human nature forbids our accepting it as an immutable fact in history.

I close with the words of a group of Chinese Christian leaders speaking last month in Shanghai. "We cannot believe", they say, "that all doors will be closed to Christian witness and service, to medical and relief work, to Christian worship and fellowship, to demonstration of true Christian faith and love. God will close some doors to open others. God can make the wrath of man to praise Him. With confidence in His sustaining grace and power, the Chinese Church faces the uncertain future. We pray that some of our missionary brothers and sisters will stand by us and share with us the perils and promises of this fateful period of China's history."

These are the words of Chinese citizens speaking as world Christians. Their words are applicable to world Christianity facing world Communism as it now does in all parts of the world.

COMMUNIST TACTICS IN PENETRATED AREAS

by T. Cuyler Young

Any study of "communist tactics in penetrated areas" would concern most of the countries of the world, to be exhaustive. This short statement, however, can attempt only to treat of a typical area; and that selected is southern Asia in general and the Middle East in particular. Only two phases of the subject can be introduced: first, a sketch of some background on communist operation in the Middle East; and, second, a few indications of current communist tactics in the area with perhaps some questions pointing to the implications that the present situation holds for the Christian Mission in that part of the Muslim world.

First, then, some background on the operation of communism in the Middle East. In this connection it is essential to emphasize

(1) the continuous interest and operation of Russian communism in the Middle East for the last three decades; and,

(2) that most of this period can be distinguished in three phases:
   (a) 1920-1927: ushered in by the Congress of the Peoples of the East at Baku in 1920 and characterized as a period of propaganda for an imminently expected revolution;
   (b) 1928-1934: inaugurated by the Sixth Comintern Congress at Moscow in 1928 and marked by anti-imperialist propaganda vs. the West in general and Britain in particular, while Russia concentrated on building "socialism in a single state" to serve as a base for the delayed World Revolution; and
   (c) 1935-1945: begun by the Seventh Comintern Congress which, without withdrawing any previous fundamental doctrines, changed tactics and invited cooperation with western capitalists vs. the threat of Nazism and Fascism.

The Baku Congress of 1920 failed to raise the expected revolution among oriental peoples. The Bolshevist invasion of Iran in that year failed to effect the revolution in that country which one leading communist described as "the Suez Canal of the Revolution" - obviously referring to India as the goal and Britain as the adversary. Moscow discovered it had first to concentrate on the communization of the border peoples within Asiatic Russia, and beyond those borders to be satisfied with "harrassing the imperialist roar" - to use a Stalinist phrase.

Consequently more important was the 1928 Comintern Congress as regards the Middle East. Its most important decisions affecting this area were:

(1) The doctrinaire decision that there is the "objective possibility of a non-capitalist path of development for the backward colonies, the possibility of the 'growing-over' of the bourgeoise-democratic revolution in the leading colonies

into the proletarian dictatorship in the other countries."* This envisaged the fore-shortening of the revolution in Asia, even in the Middle East, skipping the various phases of marxist doctrine regarding the development of capitalism in these countries. This was laying the ground for the next opportunity of crisis in the Middle East.

(2) Welcoming as the first step in this process the "bourgeoise-democratic revolution of nationalist, anti-imperial character" which had appeared in Turkey and Iran, and was being agitated by nationalists in Egypt, Iraq, and Syria. With these movements the local communist parties could temporarily cooperate, and, in some cases, even unite; but always with the guarding of ultimate communist goals and the freedom of the party to continue the education of the people regarding those ultimate goals. The Congress particularly warned against the nefarious influence of such "nationalist-reformist parties" such as the Swarjist and the Wafdist in India and Egypt, respectively.

(3) Another important instruction in this field was that the transition from the bourgeoise-democratic to the proletarian revolution could be effected only if two basic conditions were fulfilled: the existence of a strong Communist Party, and the presence of certain objective circumstances described as an "unusually deep revolutionary crisis and an unusually high and persistent revolutionary wave." And to make it very clear when this could be expected, the Theses declared: "Such a possibility is most easily presented, for example, when the ruling imperialism is temporarily distracted by a long continued war outside the frontiers of the colonial country concerned."

(4) Much attention was given to the means of building strong communist parties, briefly summarized as follows: give the parties a "genuinely proletarian" character by recruiting industrial and transport workers as well as "the semi-slaves in the plantations"; create Party nuclei everywhere, including working class tenements and barracks; do not neglect work among "journeymen, apprentices and coolies employed in small handicraft workshops"; introduce cautiously intelligentsia into the Party; promote trade-unions; create mass Young Communist Leagues; and - in the case of insurrection - promote the creation of elected soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies.

Those were the lines of communist activity in the Middle East during the thirties, with actual accomplishment rather limited. Many were unaware of the activity, but it was patiently laying the foundation for subsequent building.

As for the Seventh Comintern Congress of 1935, which set the policy for the next decade, the primary object of communists everywhere became the security of the Proletarian State, now threatened by German resurgence; and this overshadowed all other aspects of the colonial question, including the Middle East. The imperialist war was condemned and clearly world revolution was subordinated to and identified with the interests of the Proletarian State. Despite the fact that in the Middle East the sharp edge of revolutionary propaganda was turned away from France and Britain and all efforts directed vs. Germany and Italy, the basic theses and strategy of World Revolution were not abandoned.

---

*This quotation and those in the immediately following paragraphs are taken from a manuscript by Dr. George Lonczowski of Hamilton College on the subject of the relations of Russia and the West in Iran, soon to be published by the Cornell University Press, For this section of the paper the author is heavily indebted to Dr. Lonczowski.

All this became clear enough with the cessation of hostilities and an allied victory in 1945, when the world entered a new phase of the communist movement. In the Near and Middle East this has been marked by steady pressure on Turkey, and persistent infiltration and maneuvering for satellite governments in Greece and Iran. The state of the former is still critical, despite dollars and guns provided by the Truman Doctrine; and Iran only enjoys a respite from pressure, in spite of the failure of the Azorbaijan tactics to take over this "Suez Canal of the Revolution." In Palestine and the Arab World a communist flip-flop and support of Israel and partition apparently is calculated by the Kremlin to advance their revolutionary aims in the area; certainly it reduces British influence and prestige, even though it meets, strangely enough, at the only place in Asia, the policy line of the United States.

As for the present status of communism in the Middle East several significant features, for all their local variation characteristic of the whole area, call for attention:

(1) Communism probably has its greatest appeal to the disillusioned, confused, and seeking youth of the area: a youth weaned from its moorings by westernization but unintegrated into a society still dominated by unreformed elders; a youth yearning for some cause worthy of its allegiance since the traditional way of life has lost its attraction; a youth that resents the arrogance of the West yet wishes its gadgets and a new standard of living. Youth in all this is aided and abetted by many older intellectuals.

(2) Next to these, the greatest appeal of communism is to the increasing urban proletariat. Small as compared to the peasants, who are thus far little affected, it is of growing importance. Because of the blatantly unbalanced character of Middle Eastern society, with the recent war accentuating the gulf between the very rich and the very poor, this proletariat is growing in self-consciousness and discontent.

(3) Prominent amongst present communist techniques in the area is the agitation of dissident minorities, of which there are unfortunately all too many in western Asia. Chief among those are the Armenians, Assyrians, and Kurds; and anyone who has followed the post-war tactics of the Soviets knows how these groups have been exploited.

(4) The present communist propaganda tactics include the following: the steady liquidation of British influence and prestige in the area, to which end doctrinal purity and consistent conduct are often sacrificed; the studied casting of the United States in the major role of imperialist villain; the driving of as many wedges as possible between those two western powers; and internally the creation of maximum friction, frustration, and fear among the peoples of the area with a view to preventing their economic and social progress, their internal and external solidarity.

Yet despite the opportunity and all those efforts, it is probably true to state that the communists have passed the peak of their postwar effectiveness. They are busy preparing for the next chance, which they think will come with a world-wide depression originating in the United States; with the failure of the west to solve the economic and social problems of the Middle East; and, perhaps, with war in some form.

The three main reasons for this decline in present communist influence in the Middle East are: (1) A relatively clear-cut and determined policy on the part

of the western powers. (2) The kind of power held by tribal chieftains, kings, and oligarchies that makes rebellion difficult if not impossible. (3) The theology and psychology of Islam as a religious way of life which stands sceptical of change in general and opposed to atheistic communism in particular.

Now these are not absolutes, without need of some qualifications; nor are they the only reasons for this post-war decline in communist influence. But their general validity can stand, in spite of the lack of space for elaboration and qualification.

The statement of these three points raises certain questions about the strategy of the Christian Mission in the Middle East as it tries to meet the challenge of communism.

(1) The fact that in this area there is a relatively clear-cut and determined policy on the part of the western powers throws into focus the problem of the relation of the mission and missionary to western civilization and the western state. The mission realizes that the continuation of western ideals of freedom are necessary to maintain the framework in which present missionary work is possible; that this helpful framework would soon disappear under communist domination. The missionary who continues a citizen of his western homeland cannot escape certain obligations: conscious though he be of the faults and failures of his culture, so effectively publicized by the communists, should he not regard it as a less evil way of life than that of Communism, offering him his opportunity to render Christian service to his friends in whatever community he finds himself?

Yet this is a Christian Mission and the missionary a Christian. The ambassador of the Gospel owes final allegiance to a Higher Court. Western culture and any western state must stand under the judgement of the Holy Lord of Creation and History who rules in this Court of Last Resort. Difficult as it is, especially in a Muslim country, the missionary should insist upon the distinction between his country and his church, his culture and his faith, and refuse to be maneuvered into any position defending the indefensible; especially in this part of the world where Middle Easterners already know our western shortcomings only too well, without communist emphasis.

Yet the mission and the missionary, even the church and the faith - as now comprehended - must go farther and know themselves also, along with all other men and institutions, to be under the judgement of Almighty God, ready to have "a change of mind" and to accept what may seem an impossible task and devastating circumstance; for it is not impossible that communism may be God's Scourge for the farther advancement of His Kingdom.

(2) The kind of social system prevalent in the Middle East, with so much power residing in the hands of the privileged few, constitutes a paradoxical challenge to the Christian mission and missionary. "Those that turn the world upside down" must foster a revolution that runs the risk of playing into the hands of those who are alas more skilled in the direction of revolution once it is aroused. Yet the risk must be taken. The Christian mission in the Middle East must ally itself in no uncertain way with all those liberal elements that are trying to modify peacefully the social system for the benefit of the masses.

The Christian Gospel offers its exponent and advocate the opportunity of outdoing the communists when it comes to social ideals and action. Anything less than this will make the missionary an easy target for the communist in his propagandizing of the intellectuals, the youth, and the urban worker. These groups are the key

to the future in the Middle East and the ones most open to true Christian evangelism of a dynamic character. But are they the groups on which mission interest and effort are centered? The irony of the present challenge is that we ask the world mission of the church to capture abroad the very groups in society which at home the church is least able to hold and to inspire.

(3) Finally we come to the role of Islam in the struggle against communism, to the relation of the Christian mission and missionary to Islam. I am not one who leans back unperturbed on the cliche that Islam will never open its doors to atheistic communism. "It can happen here!" No religious way of life, certainly not Islam, is so constituted that it automatically guarantees vs. communism. To think so would be to deceive ourselves.

Yet there are solid elements in Islam that make it difficult for any alien propaganda to succeed, as the Christian mission can attest: a strong conviction that the truth of Allah is theirs; a conservative, almost fatalistic, attitude toward change in general; and ancient, traditional organization and integration of society that for most until very recently was truly satisfying to the soul. Despite the governmental organization and political oligarchy pointing in the other direction, there is a very real and tangible spiritual and social democracy in the Middle East which, when allied with religio-cultural loyalty, very often senses the negation of all this in communist totaliterianism. Finally, there is the vivid religious nature of the orthodox Muslim which recoils from the atheism and dialectical materialism of doctrinaire communism.

In conclusion, I would suggest - or at least ask - whether it may not be possible that one approach of the Christian Mission to communism may not be a new approach to Islam. Nowhere else in the world has the Christian Mission faced the kind of a task it has in the tightly-knit Muslim world; and nowhere else has it been so accustomed to measure its success so much in terms of the indirect affect it has had upon the thought and conduct of the society to which it has ministered rather than in the size and potency of the indigenous church it has founded.

Without thinking of abandoning the goal of such an indigenous church to be a part of the emerging ocumenical community, contributing to that community its peculiar gifts, I would raise the question as to whether perhaps the time has come for a radical reappraisal of the relations of Christendom and Islam, Christianity and Muhammadanism, the Christian and the Muslim: looking toward the exploration of what we hold in common and how we may unitedly resist the communist paganism.

Cherished truth and value in both faiths and ways of life, common to the foundations of both, are challenged by communism and self-preservation for each may call for the cooperation of both in a bold and dynamic fashion; and then the traditional picture bequeathed by the centuries of misunderstanding may be discovered for what it is and each may find the other in new experiences to be actually different than this inherited picture. This need never compromise anything essential in the Christian faith; yet certainly we can trust the Holy Spirit to use it for the exaltation of Christ and the glory of God.

It just might be the way to the fulfilment of the word of Jesus, "Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit. He that loveth his life loseth it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."

IV.

COMMUNISM'S CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIANITY

by Kermit Eby

Paradoxical as it may seem I have never been solicited to become a member of the Communist party of the U.S.A. This, despite the fact that, doubtless because of my work, I have come in contact with many persons who are members of the party. Nevertheless, whenever I mention my failure to be invited to join the Marxist elect, the reactions of my friends are mixed. The more gracious ascribe the phenomenon to the adequacy of my personal philosophy and my independence of spirit. The less kindly, sometimes infer that I am more useful to the comrades outside the party than in it.

Be the situation as it may, it is of no particular significance. However, certain of the experiences, which have been mine, may be of some importance in interpreting the challenge of Communism to Christianity. I am a member of the Church of the Brethren. Every home, church and educational experience of mine emphasized the fact that I was born into the world for a purpose. Unfortunately it has been my lot to experience some of the world and to become certain of my purpose.

To be specific, until September 15, I was Education and Research Director for the C.I.O. In this capacity I experienced intimately the power struggle which is contained in C.I.O. During the last year this struggle has made me increasingly uncomfortable. Frankly, I was unwilling to line up with the right against the left, not that I was pro-left, simply, that I was not pro-right - a pro-right that is convinced that the liquidation of Communism here and abroad is the answer to all our problems.

Before continuing, I should point out the obvious. There are two extreme poles of power concentration in the C.I.O., the Communist pole and the A.C.T.U. pole (Association of Catholic Trade Unions). Both receive their impetus and inspiration from without the C.I.O. Both believe the control of the C.I.O. is part of the struggle for the control of the world. In between, are the members of the floundering center, people often without a base and weak because of lack of coordinated purpose. It is to this center that I am emotionally attached. Because of this attachment, I hope to give the remainder of my life to the development of young people, who are socially and economically radical and absolutely non-authoritarian.

Before continuing, it is important that we examine the challenge of Communism, not that I am convinced that the historical challenge of Communism will be met in conferences like this or in other gathering of intellectuals. Frankly, it is my conviction that Communism's challenge rests in the hope it offers to the depressed masses of the world. They, the naked, hungry, and oppressed are looking for an escape from their misery, and either we or the Communist will supply the answers to those oppressed of the world.

Believing, therefore as I do, namely that the counter-revolution can only succeed if it becomes more radical and more humanitarian than the Communist,- it is obvious that I would be increasingly uncomfortable as reaction increased here, and the drift to war accelerated. Reaction or war it seems to me will never succeed in obliterating the challenge of Communism. If anything, it will create the conditions on which Communism thrives. It may be an exaggerated statement, but I am convinced there are many persons and influences in the world who hate Communism so intently

that they believe war with Russia and liquidation of America's Communists is desirable.

To such people, Communism is the anti-Christ. Like fascism it is the absolute evil, so evil it must be eradicated if necessary by "burnings at the stake" and war. Frankly, as violently as I detest totalitarianism, I am convinced that Communism is a heresy, not the anti-Christ. In other words, its emphasis on job-security, racial equality and peace (after the revolution) accounts for its appeal; and if this is so we must be more radical for better reasons, and meet the needs of the world.

In order to understand our dilemma, we must be sensitive to the nature of the contemporary world, particularly labor which here and around the world is coming into political power.

American labor leadership has its roots in the great depression of 1931-32. Those who lead labor are determined never again to walk the bread lines of America. Perhaps, the most significant historic fact to know is labor's determination never again to accept the business cycle as an act of God. If we can plan for war, we must plan for peace, labor insists. After all, labor argues that the 9,000,000 unemployed in 1939 only went to work when Europe went to war. And when we went to war, innumerable millions of workers had tomato juice, meat and decent clothes for the first time. We produced both guns and butter. Now, we are enjoying maximum employment, producing the goods to fill the vacuum produced by the World War II and preparing for World War III. Sad, isn't it, that our capitalist economy has only been able to solve the problem of unemployment when preparations for war, war, or its aftermath, uses up our surpluses. Sit it was with Germany, and Japan, and now, us!

Out of such facts communism breeds. Fundamentalist Marxists insist that depressions and war are inherent in Capitalism. It is our responsibility to prove that they are wrong; to prove that we can build houses, schools and playgrounds; provide food, and educational opportunity, in other words, to strengthen our economic institutions, and thus our political ones.

Perhaps it can best be expressed by saying we must put human rights above property rights, men above machines. During the depression, for example, Robert Nathan tells us we lost some $300,000,000,000 of wealth thru idleness, wealth which translated into production would have face-lifted America, cleared its slums, re-built its schools and conserved its resources.

Eighteen million unemployed and 300 billions of wealth lost is more than we can comprehend. Only sensitivity to the tragedy of individuals gives these statistics meaning. And such sensitivity is a by-product of a clear understanding that a man achieves a full expression of manhood when he as husband and father meets the needs of his wife and children.

We have three children, the youngest is seven. And as I once wrote in an article entitled "A Lolly-Pop for Danny," we play a little game when I have been away from home. He meets me at the door, and asks if I have anything for him. I hesitate and say, "Why should I have something for you?" And he looks at me with disappointment in his eyes. I reconsider and look in my pocket and pull out some gum or candy. And as I give it to him, his faith in me is restored and mine in myself affirmed.

Thus the need of all men is expressed in the needs of one.

Today, greatest challenge is the achievement of man's economic necessities, without destroying his personal freedom. We want bread but not at the price of slavery.

Ever since my interest in this, I have speculated on the difference between the labor movement in Britain and elsewhere. Why has Britain and British labor movement avoided the pitfalls of dictatorship? Why, in a sense, have they maintained a finer socialism than the Russians whose Marxism has been corrupted by Peter the Great? Recently, I asked this question of a brilliant editor of "Labor and Statesmen." His reply surprised me. British labor, he said, grew up with the Chapel, the Methodist lay ministry, and the cooperative. And the idealism from these sources still permeates it.

If he was right, the lesson is obvious. The direction of American labor, yes, even American Democracy, will be dtermined by our ability, yours and mine, to grow up with it - and to maintain our ideals as we do so. Christianity then can meet the challenge of Communism in the realm of Economics by translating the abstract concepts of justice it preaches on Sunday into specific programs of action on Monday and all the other days of the week. Frankly, such a translation demands among other things:

(1) Long range democratic planning for peacetime production.
(2) The substitution of cooperative and group ownership for corporate exploitation and monopoly.
(3) The development of a system where increased productivity means increased wages as well as profits.
(4) A living annual wage for everyone willing and able to work.
(5) Inclusion of the worker in the planning of production. Real labor-management relations.

Without elaborating these points permit me to say that here and throughout the world, the workers are turning away from the Church because it offers them platitudes when they are looking for bread. If we would win those who live next to the stark realities of life, we cannot offer them simply "pie in the sky, by and by."

As recently as September 27, 28, 29, I attended the meeting of the U.S. National Commission for U.N.E.S.C.O. of which I am a member. At this meeting the chief concern of the Conference was Russia, the impregnibility of the iron curtain, and to some extent the inevitability of war. There was little "mea culpa" at the meeting, and at times our self-righteousness sickened me not a little bit.

Up to date U.N.E.S.C.O. has held no meetings in the south for reasons which are obvious. Perhaps we have no iron curtain. We certainly have a silken one which makes it impossible for even cultured Americans to escape one of the tensions which lead to war, and incidentally give the Communists one of their strongest talking points.

In 1933, when I was in Japan with the Friends good-will mission, I learned one of my most poignant lessons, when the Japanese students asked me, "Why do you send us missionaries who preach the brotherhood of man, and tolerate an Exclusion Act, which violates it?"

Incidentally, I never discovered a satisfactory answer. However, I was impressed when Commander Morrison, the great naval historian, included the Exclusion Act among the two most important factors which contributed to the victory of the military party in Japan.

Now to return to the iron curtain; no matter how impenetrable it is, knowledge of the fulfillment of the promises of democracy will always penetrate it, and frustrate those here at home who would exploit our hypocrisy for their own ends. They tell me racism is not a besetting Soviet sin.

The argument might be pursued even further. For example, I never could understand why I should keep silent about imperialism in Indonesia just because Harry Bridges and Joseph Stalin had discovered it. Nor why the magnificant precedent we set in the Philippines and the British in India should not be applied wherever men are struggling for their freedom.

Again I am sure such affirmative action would ring the bells of history so resonantly that no iron curtain could shut out their reverberations. Perhaps my annoyance with well intentioned liberals reaches its height at this point. We know so much and do so little. Sometimes I think we spend so much time looking under the beds for Communists, we neglect the tasks at hand. Personally, I would like to have the Communist look under the bed for us, for a while. Herman Rauschnig expressed the idea more adequately when he said "Democracy must make the positive values of love and justice more meaningful than the Nazis make the negative values of hate and intolerance if they would triumph in the contest for the German mind." Paraphrasing Rauschnig, I would say that we Christians must insist, in season and out, on the brotherhood of man and all that it means in the everyday relations of men and nations. For, could it be possible that men can unite against some real or imagined enemy like Communism, more enthusiastically than they can unite in the achievement of the promises of Democracy.

In the area of race relations as in economics, we who work for Democracy must not be content with just a little Democracy, for a little is not enough. As I have already intimated, job security, racial equality and peace (after the revolution) are the three most emphatic claims of Communism.

For the moment it might be of some value to examine the international problem. According to my way of thinking, it offers the same dilemma. Do we as a nation line up with the right wing reaction because of our hatred of Communist totalitarianism? In other words, in a Europe which, I am convinced, wants nothing more to do with a decadent capitalism, do we encourage the Social Democratic forces which would socialize their economy and maintain their liberty, or do we line up with their enemies? Are we doomed in our blindness to drift without any particular goal in mind save alliance with reaction and war?

I am not convinced such drift is inevitable. And I am doubly convinced that the determination of our foreign policy and the direction it takes will be decided by you and me when we cast our vote in our local, congressional and national elections. Specifically, if the forces of conservatism triumph here, our foreign policy will be increasingly conservative, and conversely if our domestic policy is more liberal our foreign policy will be increasingly so.

Therefore, as always, the decisions are ours and they make it mandatory that you and I participate in the politics of our unions and the political party of our choice.

Recently it was my opportunity to speak to several hundred ministers and other church workers who had come to Washington to lobby for peace. Many of them had come to Washington for the first time. As emphatically as I knew how I stressed two points when I addressed them:

(1) Opposition to U.M.T., as important as it was, is not enough.
Peace will only come as we avoid the tensions which lead to war.
Therefore F.E.P.C. legislation, housing, etc., are also of concern to us.

(2) It was in a way immoral for ministers and others who probably believe politics corrupt to lobby the products of a corrupt process. Lobbying as important as it is, is never so important as direct political action at home in ward and precinct. And as every preacher knows, the caucus is the most important event of all in the political process.

My red-bearded Dunkard grandfather used to preach quite vehemently when I was a boy in the Bango church in Northern Indiana on the "sins of omission." I don't think I really understood what he meant until I experienced government by default. And so by way of summary, permit me to say once more that foreign policy is not separate and distinct from domestic policy. And furthermore the forces which win out in America will seek their natural counterparts around the world.

There is much more which might be said in a discussion of Communism's challenge to Christianity. It seems to me I may have said enough. All that I have said can be resaid in a few words. Christians must be more radical than Communists, and never forget what Emerson meant when he said, "Tho end pre-exists in the means."

A year ago last Thanksgiving I was in Paris with U.N.E.S.C.O. Thanksgiving afternoon and evening we were the guests of the American ambassador. Before the main meal was served we were offered giant cocktails, great piles of sandwiches were stacked on the tables for us to eat, lest we starve before the main meal was served. When dinner was served, it shrunk into insignificance the meals of Pennsylvania Dutch Indiana. We had three kinds of meat, turkey, ham and roast beef; a different wine was served with each meat. Champagne was served as swiftly as it was consumed. Vegetables and salads interspersed the meat courses. The chief course was followed by desserts and coffee, which in turn was followed by fruit. As I ate, I began to think (perhaps I should not have remained sober) and as I thought, I said to myself: now I understand Veblen's theory of ostentatious spending. Just a little bit disgusted, I thought that this is why the Communists would liquidate us - and perhaps rightfully so.

All would have been well, had I not accepted an invitation to a similar affair given by the C.G.T. (French Federation of Labor). If anything, this new elite was worse. The foods were stacked even higher and the wine flowed more freely - and the new elite was dedicated to the uplift of the proletariat.

In between these two dinners I visited some schools with a Quaker relief worker. I noticed the children's lunch consisted of cold, boiled potatoes or black bread and onions, if they were lucky.

U.N.E.S.C.O. seeks to serve children, the C.G.T. is dedicated to the revolution. The Quakers serve without being corrupted perhaps, because they "suffer with those who suffer." I am sure I do not know, but also sure I understand them better!

The first Occasional Bulletin

THE CHALLENGE OF COMMUNISM TO CHRISTIANITY

June, 1948

Contents

The Appeal of Communism	by Matthew Spinka
Christianity and Communism	by John C. Bennett
What's Wrong with Communism	by Norman Thomas
Communism in China (to May, 1948)	by W. Plumer Mills
The Czech Road to Communism	by Kenneth D. Miller
Two Forms of Tyranny	by Reinhold Niebuhr
The Christian Answer to Communism	by L. S. Albright
The Comprehensive Ministry to Community Needs (A Practical Christian Answer to Communism)	by J. Merle Davis
A Selected Bibliography on Communism and Its Significance for Christianity (annotated)	by L. S. Albright and W. Plumer Mills

- - -

Copies of this printed booklet are still available at the following prices

1-9 copies at 20¢ each
10-99 copies at 15¢ each
100-999 copies at $12.50 per hundred
1000 or more copies at $10.00 per hundred

Committee to Study a Christian Approach to Communism
of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America
156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y.